



---

A Zervanite Apocalypse II

Author(s): R. C. Zaehner

Source: *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London*, Vol. 10, No. 3 (1940), pp. 606-631

Published by: Cambridge University Press on behalf of School of Oriental and African Studies

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/608832>

Accessed: 18/11/2013 03:16

---

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at

<http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Cambridge University Press and School of Oriental and African Studies are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

## A Zervanite Apocalypse II

By R. C. ZAEHNER

Owing to service in H.M. Forces it has been impossible to check references in all cases. The reader's indulgence is therefore sought for any errors which may have slipped into the text.

### ZĀTSPRAM, Chapter XXIV<sup>1</sup>

#### *Translation*

C CONCERNING the accomplishment of the Rejuvenation.

(1) It is revealed in the Religion that Zoroaster asked Ohrmazd (saying) : .“ Shall bodily creatures who have passed away on earth, receive again their bodies at the Rejuvenation, or shall they be like unto shades ? ”

(2) Ohrmazd said : “ They shall receive again their bodies and shall rise up.”

(3) And Zoroaster asked (saying) : “ He who hath passed away is dismembered by dog and bird and carried off by wolf and vulture : how shall (their parts) come together again ? ”

(4) Ohrmazd said : “ If thou who art Zoroaster hadst to make a wooden casket, how would it be easier to make, if thou hadst no wood and yet hadst to fashion and fit it, or if thou hadst a casket and its joints were sundered one from the other, and thou hadst to fit it together again ? ”

(5) Zoroaster said : “ If I had a branch of wood, it would be easier than if I had no wood ; and if I had a casket, and its joints <were sundered one from the other>, it would be easier. . . .”

(6) Ohrmazd said : “ When those creations were not, I had power to fashion them ; and now when they have been, and are scattered abroad, it is easier to fit them together again.

(7) “ For I have five collectors who receive the bodily substance of those who passed away : one is the earth which keeps watch over the meat and bone and fat of men : one is the water which keeps watch over the flesh and blood : one the plants which preserve the hair (of the head) and the hair (of the body) : one the light of the firmament (?) which receives the fire : one is the very wind which <gives back> the life of my own creatures at the time of the Rejuvenation.

(8) “ I call upon the earth, and ask of it the bone and meat and fat of Gayōmart and the others. (9) The earth saith, ‘ How shall

<sup>1</sup> For the text v. *BSOS.* X, pp. 377-398.

I bring (them), for I know not which is the <bone, meat, and fat> of the one <and which of the other?'

(10) "I call upon the water of the Arang which is the Tigris among rivers (saying), 'Bring forth the blood of the men who are dead.' (11) The water saith, 'How shall I bring (it), for I know not which is the blood of the one and which of the other?'

(12) "I call upon the plants, and ask of them the hair of the men who are dead. (13) The plants say, 'How shall we bring (it), for we know not which is the hair of the one and which of the other?'

(14) "I call upon the wind, and ask him for the life of the men who are dead. (15) The wind saith, 'How shall I bring (it), for I know not which is the life of the one and which of the other?'

(16) "When I who am Ohrmazd look back on to the earth, water, plants, light, and wind, in my clear sight I know and distinguish the one from the other: for in my omniscience and clear thought I distinguish the one from the other even as when \*a man milks the milk of females, and it runs forth over the earth in the same channel one within the other, he knows of which of his females it is\*; I recognize (them) even as when a man hath thirty horses, and each horse has a caparison with a mark on it (to show) to which horse it belongs, and those thirty caparisons stand together, and (the man) then wishes to know; he takes off all the caparisons and knows by the mark on the caparison which of his horses is which.

(17) "I shall send forth Airyaman, the Messenger, among whose duties is the fulfilment of the end. (18) He shall bring the bone and blood and hair and light and life of Gayōmart and Mašyā and Mašyānē; (19) and first shall I fit together again the bones of Gayōmart, and the little and small amount that is joined to Mašyā and Mašyānē shall I give to him.

(20) "And it is easier for me to fit together and create again the twelve creations that I created in the beginning; first when I created the sky without pillar or support which no material creature supports from any side; and second when I established the earth in the middle of the sky so that it was nearer to neither side, like the yolk of an egg in the middle of an egg; and third when I fashioned the Sun; fourth when I fashioned the Moon; <fifth when I fashioned the stars>; sixth when I created many hues, colours, and tastes in the plants; seventh when I created fire within the plants, and it did not burn; eighth when I brought corn to the earth, and at the time when it has grown, it bears fruit, and serves as food for man and beast; ninth

when I established the embryo within females, and covered it up so that it did not die, and as it grew I revealed one by one bone, blood, hair, phlegm, fat, and nails ; tenth when I caused corporeal birds to fly with wings in the atmosphere ; eleventh when I gave the water feet to move forward like a hare (?)<sup>1</sup> ; twelfth <when I created the clouds> that carry the water up and rain down the rain.”

(21) The creating of creation, the progress of Religion and the accomplishment of the Rejuvenation was like unto the building of a house. (22) For a house is finished by means of three instruments, that is the floor, the walls, and the roof : and the creating of creation is the floor, the progress of Religion the walls, and the accomplishment of the Rejuvenation the roof. (23) As when a man desires to build a house, he chooses three men of whom one is most skilled in laying the floor, one in raising the walls, and one in making the roof ; and each is assigned to his proper work. Till the floor was laid and the walls raised, it was not possible (to make the roof). (24) He who bade the house (be built) knows clearly with how many (instruments) it will be finished, and because he has no doubts, he puts abiding trust in the skill of the maker of the roof. When the wall is completed, it is as easy for him whose business is the roof, to roof (the house) in as (it is) for those (others) in the work that is assigned them.

(25) And again the accomplishment of the Rejuvenation was like unto a dark night : when the night draws to its close, the Sun arises in three corners of the earth and returns to its proper place and completes its cycle, and comes to shine anew, and smites the darkness and gloom.

(26) It was like unto the Moon which waxes for fifteen (days), and for fifteen wanes. When it has completely disappeared, it is born anew, and is manifest with the brilliance (it has) from the Sun, the lord of lights : the restoration of the world of the Resurrection is made manifest thereby.

(27) It was like unto the year, in which, in spring, the trees blossom, in summer they bear fruit, in autumn they bear the last fruits, and in winter they become dry and as if dead. (28) When the order of the years is fulfilled, Mihr returns to his primal place, day and night are equal in measure, and the atmosphere (returns to) its original (?) rule.

<sup>1</sup> Reading *xargōš* (خَرْجَشׁ) instead of *'hastīh* (هَسْتِه).

And the Resurrection of the dead is like unto trees and shrubs that put forth new foliage and blossom with saplings. (29) For the restoration of a fixed order the end of all natures is in the same manner as the beginning, even as man whose being springs from the sperm, or as the plants whose being is from seed ; their perfect end is in the self-same seed.

(30) In the Religion thus is it revealed : When Ahriman rushed into creation, he had the brood of the demon Whore of evil religion as his companion even as a man has a whore-woman as his bedfellow ; for verily the Whore is a demon ; and he appointed the demon Whore queen of her brood, for verily she is the chief of all the whore-demons, the most grievous adversary of the Blessed Man.

(31) And <the demon Whore> of evil religion united <with the Blessed Man> ; for the defilement of females, she united with him, that she might defile females, and the females, because they were defiled, might defile the males, and (the males) would turn aside from their duty.

(32) And he chose a commander and a captain who verily is Āz (Lust) ; and he gave her four commanders to help her, who are Wrath (*Ēšm*) and Winter and Old Age and Bane (*Sēz*) like unto the East and West and South and North. (33) Āz chose commanders, captains of a few and captains of small numbers, which are Hunger and Thirst ; so too did Old Age (choose) Lamentation and Wailing ; so too did Bane (choose) Excess and Deficiency.

(34) At the Rejuvenation first a means against Āz is sought, for she is the commander and captain of the other Lies, and from her has Ahriman of evil religion most strength. (35) When first creation began to move and Zurvān for the sake of movement brought that form, the black and ashen garment, to Ahriman, (he made) a treaty in this wise, "This is that weapon, like unto fire, blazing, harassing all creatures, that containeth the very essence of Āz. When the period of nine thousand years comes to an end, if thou hast not perfectly fulfilled that which thou didst threaten in the beginning, that thou wouldst bring all material existence to hate Ohrmazd and love thee—and verily this is the belief in one principle, that the increaser and destroyer are the same—then by means of these weapons Āz will devour that which is thine, thy creation ; and she herself shall starve ; for she shall not obtain food from the creatures of Ohrmazd—like unto a frog that liveth in the water ; so long as he defileth the water,

he liveth by it, but when the water is withdrawn from him, he dieth parched.

(36) And Āz, because she had (only) one nature, had not the power to cause defilement so long as creatures were scattered ; that her powers might be set in motion together within creation, she divided them in three, that is “ that pertaining to natural function ”, “ that pertaining to natural function directed outward ”, and “ outside natural function ”. “ That pertaining to natural function ” is that which consists in eating to which life (*jān*) is bound : “ that pertaining to natural function directed outward ” is the desire to mingle (copulate) which is called Lust (*Varan*) itself, through which by a glance outwards the inwards are excited and the nature of the body confused : “ outside natural function ” is the yearning for whatever good thing one sees or hears.

(37) Each part was divided into two : “ that pertaining to natural function ” is hunger and thirst : “ that pertaining to natural function directed outwards ” is the emitting and the receiving (of semen) : “ outside natural function ” is hoarding by robbery and refusing to give through miserliness.

(38) This is she who comprises (all) evil. And it is revealed that at the end Artvahīṣt will come to earth with the powerful help of Airyaman, the Messenger, to find a remedy against Āz : and he will show to creatures that the slaughter of the divers kinds of cattle is a grievous sin and that the benefit therefrom is small ; and this will he command : “ Ye are men ; be not thus slaughterers of cattle even as hitherto ye have slaughtered cattle.”

(39) When the time of the accomplishment of the Rejuvenation draws nigh, those who hearken to the command of Artvahīṣt shall turn from the slaughter of cattle and the eating of flesh, and one-quarter of the power of Āz shall grow less, and the goodness that is in her body shall be destroyed, and the parts of darkness and gloom shall be smitten : nature shall be clad in spirit (*mēnōkīkīh*), and intelligences shall be more clearly grasped.

(40) In the bodies of the children that are born to them Āz shall be less strong, and their bodies will stink less, and their nature will be more closely bound to the Gods. Instructed by the Gods they will turn from the drinking of milk ; half the power of Āz shall grow less. (41) And those who are born to them shall be sweet-smelling, lacking darkness, spiritual in nature, without offspring, because they will not eat.

(42) And then the demon Āz, since she derives no power from the creatures of Ohrmazd, shall chide Ahriman who appointed her captain of commanders, (saying) in her greed to the judge of creatures : “Satisfy me, satiate me, for I derive no food or strength from the creatures of Ohrmazd.” (43) At the command of Ahriman she shall destroy the lesser demons. At the last (only) those four commanders will remain, and the other two, Ahriman and Āz.

(44) Forth to the earth come Ohrmazd and Ahriman, Srōš and Āz. Ohrmazd smites Ahriman : so long as Āz was an ally to Ahriman he found no means (to smite him), for Ohrmazd is the all-creator of Light, and the darkness of Ahriman is his adversary ; Srōš the Blessed is (the god) of the Mean, that is the spirit of the Mean, and the Excess and Deficiency of Āz are his adversary ; they are of equal stature in the battle. (45) But when Āz is <no longer> an ally to Ahriman, Ahriman is alone, and his adversaries are three—two of a different essence, that is Ohrmazd and Srōš, and one of the same essence, that is Āz, his greatest ally. When his helpmate becomes his enemy, the Adversary shall be vanquished.

(46) When there are yet fifty-seven years to pass till the accomplishment of the Rejuvenation, the birth of Sōšyans shall come to pass, the consummation of that which was bestowed on Zoroaster.

(47) Concerning Zoroaster thus is it revealed—for thirty years he consulted with Ohrmazd, and he received the Religion, and he spread godliness abroad. In fifty-seven years the religion reached the seven climes partially : the Lie, once manifest and plain to see, <fled> beneath the earth, and their power was partially destroyed.

(48) When the Messenger of consummation who is Sōšyans, the Envoy and Airyaman, appears on earth, in like manner he consults for thirty years with the spiritual gods (*mēnōkān*). The time for the accomplishment of the Rejuvenation is also fifty-seven years ; completely spread abroad, it shall reach the seven climes ; and when it is completely spread abroad, the Lie shall be uprooted from creation.

(49) When the Adversary came upon creation, six thousand years of the “reckoned calendar” remained—that is from the day of Ohrmazd in the month of Fravartīn until the period returns to the day of Ohrmazd in the month of Fravartīn—for the completion of six thousand years of the intercalary calendar the equivalent of four years (are needed) : for in every four years there is one intercalated day, not more ; in six thousand years that is the equivalent of four years. At that time will come the sign of the Resurrection, and the

Firmament (*Spihr*) shall move, and the course of the Sun, Moon, and stars shall be \*like unto the planets\* (?) ; even as the Firmament revolves, the atmosphere and the seas along with the earth and the abodes (of men) shall turn from their natural <paths>. On earth, in the likeness of springs of water, springs of fire shall arise in many places. (50) For Ohrmazd created with water, and shall bring about the end with fire : for water has a nature that illuminates the seed and causes it to grow, and fire (a nature) that burns and thwarts it ; for when the seed of plants comes to water, it has the power of growth, and it becomes moist.

(51) When that fire appears on earth, the waters begin to sink, and the rain ceases to rain till most of the waters on the earth become deserts, and the colour of plants (*čihrān*) on earth turns to the colour of wine (?) because of their union with fire, and they are burnt up, and the \*tillage shall be of no effect.

(52) When there are three months to pass before the accomplishment of the Rejuvenation, the great battle shall come to pass, even as in the beginning creation was at war with the Lie. For ninety days and nights there was war, a battle of thirty days and nights by the rain that smites noxious creatures, of thirty days and nights by the streaming forth of the vapours through which the plants grow, of thirty days and nights by the wind which drives the water on, and supports the earth below and above and makes hollows and heights.

(53) But as the great battle in the beginning was by the raining of water and the wind that furthers the water, so is the (battle) in the end by the burning and scorching of fire and the fearful wind that makes the fire to blaze.

(54) As (first) for ninety days and nights the Gods did battle with the demons and the Whore, so in the end, manifest and plain, there shall be seen by night and in the atmosphere a form of fire in the shape of a man, conceived by the spiritual (gods), fiery and, as it were, riding a horse, and fearful (to behold) : and they shall not doubt.

### Notes

(1) A shorter form of the colloquy of Zoroaster and Ohrmazd is found GrBd. 221, 12, *čēyōn 'gōþēt 'ku Zartuxšt 'hač Ōhrmazd pursīt : tan i vāt ānīt 'ut 'āp vāzīt 'hač 'ku 'apāč 'gīrēnd, 'ut ristāxēz čēyōn 'bavēt ?* “As it is said that Zoroaster asked Ohrmazd : ‘Whence shall they bring back the body that the wind has carried away and

the water borne off ? And what will the manner of the Resurrection of the dead ? ” ” The simile of the casket is only found in Zātspram.

(3) *visānd* ۲۷۳. It seems necessary to distinguish two words  
 (i) ۱۱۴۰۱ = *vēx̥tan* (FrPhl., p. 76. NP. يختن “ sift”), and  
 (ii) ۱۱۴۰۲ = *visāndan* “ separate ”. In our present passage the reading ‘*vēcēnd* is precluded by the following part. *burt*: ۲۷۴ must then be a participle passive. That being so, our word cannot be an ideogram, for in that case final *t* would be written, not *d* as here, cf. *LMYTWNt* always = ‘*aβgand* though the latter has *d* written phonetically. The reading *vi + sānd* is assured by the meaning “ separate, scatter ”. Cf. Dd. 36, 40, ‘*vattar Vāy* <‘*pat*> *visānišn*, ‘*jān* ‘*hač tan stōβēnītan*, “ The evil Vāy by separation, scaring the breath-soul out of the body.” DkM. 276, 8, *murt-ič humiθr nēvak kām hač-iš* ‘*nē visānēnīt*, “ And when he is dead, their kindly goodwill is not separated from him.”

Further we have *visāndak*, ۲۷۵ in DkM. 407, 1, *visāndak* ‘*ut zruſtak* ‘*ut sūtak* ‘*ut xāk-āmēk*, “ separated and scattered and worn away and mingled with the dust.” (*zruſtak* <*uz* + \**raup-* NP. *rufstan* “ sweep ”, Soghd. *prwp*- *Dhyāna* 1 : cf. Bailey, *BSOS.*, VII, p. 81 : *sūtak* NP. سود, DkM. 461, 3, *sūtakīh i vīmārīh*. *Ibid.*, 304, 7, *ašgahānīh* ‘*ut sūtakīh*. The word is very common in Dk.) DkM. 433, 17, ‘*pas* ‘*hač ‘vas ‘ān i patkārišnīk uskārišnīk čim-vičōdīšnīk pursišn* ‘*ut passax*” \**i ram* <*i*> *hāvišt visāndak* *xādišnīhā passačak*, “ After many controversial, doctrinal, and probing questions and answers suitable to the separate inquiries of a band of disciples.” Our word survives in NP. گسایندن “ break off ”.

Etymologically our word is plainly to be referred to a base \**sān-* whence (i) MParthT. Soghd. (Henning, *ManBBB*. s.v.) *sn-* “ ascend ” ; Soghd. MParthT. *syn-* “ raise ” (v. Ghilain, *Essai sur la langue parthe*, p. 90) ; MPers. and ParthT. *s’n-* “ raise ”.

(ii) With preverb *ā*, in *xār-ā-sān* “ sunrise ”.

(iii) With preverb *ava-* : MParthT. ‘*wsnyndyft* “ descent ” ; Phl. ‘*ōsān-* “ drop ” (v. *BSOS.*, IX, p. 893, where the etymology suggested is, however, wrong, v. Henning, *BSOS.*, X, p. 509). MPersT. ‘*ws’n-*, ‘*dwr* ‘*wd* ‘*bn’m* ‘*yš wyspn* ‘*d’mn* ‘*br* ‘*ws’nynd* ‘*wd ryčynd*, “ The fire and excrement which all creatures drop and pour upon it ” (unpublished ; information very kindly supplied by Dr. Henning).

(iv) Finally with *vi-* in our own *visān-* “separate”.

*dālman*: the following interpretation, with which I agree, has been suggested to me by Professor Bailey: *dālman* < \**darr-man* < OP. \**darnu-mani* = Av. *zarənu-manay-*. The word occurs as an epithet of *kahrkāsa-*, “the vulture” in Yt. 14, 33, and, misspelt, Yt. 16, 13. Since *dālman* itself means “vulture” in Pahlavī, there can be little doubt of the correctness of Bailey’s etymology. Moreover, GrBd. 155, 10, confirms it: the passage is obviously based on Yt. 14, 33, and for *zarənu-manay-* the author gives not only his own wrong interpretation, *zarmān-mēnišnīh*, “whose thoughts are on old age,” but also the Pahlavī equivalent, *dālman-karkās zarmān-mēnišnīh 'hast i dālman*. The development \**darnu-* > *dāl* is noteworthy.

(4) *kiβōt*: LW. through Syriac, from Gk. *κιβωτός*, v. Bailey in *BSOS.*, VII, p. 78, where the cognates are given: to these may be added Mandæan *qubwt'* (Brandt, *Mandäische Religion*, p. 124).

*hugar*, **هُجَار**: reading assured from the parallel passage GrBd, 222, 12, *ēvak ēvak 'hač 'arēšān 'kad 'dāt pat-iš duškartar 'būt ku rist-āχēzišnīh*. “When I created each single one of those, it was more difficult than the Resurrection of the dead.” *hugar* has two meanings: (i) “easy”, as here and in §§ 5, 6, 20, cf. Dd. 36, 3, *ētōn-ič 'ān i brēhēnīt brēhēnišnīh hugartar 'ut škiftīh kam 'hač dām-dahišnīh*, “Thus the (re)-fashioning of what has (already) been fashioned is easier and less marvellous than the act of creation”; (ii) “beneficent” clearly in DkM. 124, 16, *'avē i huχ<sup>v</sup>atāy dahyupat . . . . . i hugar rōšn dātār nazdtom*, “The governor of a province whose rule is good . . . . . who is nearest to the beneficent bright Creator.” So *ibid.*, 598, 16, *pat-iš dēsīt Kang-diž i aβd-kart 'pat hugar-dārišnīh pānakīh 'vas varč 'ut χ<sup>v</sup>arr 'ut rāz i dēn*, “By him was built Kang-diž, the marvellously wrought, by his beneficent maintenance, protection, and much wondrous power and good fortune and the mystery of the Religion.” So probably also *ibid.*, 102, 3; 626, 19.

*ātak*: for the **اتک** of the text Anklesaria proposed **اتک**, that is, one supposes, *'ēt tāk* as in the first line of § 5. It would seem, however, that our word must be the same as the **اتک** occurring after *kiβōt* in § 5. The meaning must here be “joint” or “component part”. Phl. *'ik*, translating, or rather transliterating Av. *adka-* “upper garment”, does not help. GrBd. 50, 8, has *χ<sup>v</sup>aršēt mūšparīk 'ō ray i χ<sup>v</sup>ēš bast <'pat> ātak 'ut ham-patmānakīh*, “The Sun bound Mūšparīk to his chariot (or ‘brilliance’, reading *brēh* with ŠGV., Ch. 4), with

a bond (joint) and a fitting together.” DkM. 141, 4, *nizārīh i ēvak zōrīh i 'ō ātak*, ‘ut *sustīh i-šān katāmiyān-ič* ፪ ‘ō ‘ditān is insufficiently clear. Zs. 3, 24, where the word also occurs, is desperately corrupt. It would seem that the word is to be connected with Av. *hā-*, *hātay-* “ Stück ”, and should therefore be read either *ātak* or *hitak* < *hita-*, participle from *hā-*. Cf. also MPersT. “*d* “ moment ” (Henning, BSOS., IX, p. 79).

𐭠𐭣𐭢 in DkM. 806, 10 ; 808, 11 is unconnected, being Av. *haxtay-*.

(5) Text very corrupt.

(7) *vars* ‘ut *mōd* : the distinction between hair of the body and that of the head is presumably implied. In Frōim 3, *vars* is explained as the hair ‘ān i *apar sar*.

\**ras-rōšnīh* : for *ras*, v. BSOS., IX, p. 313. The emendation which involves only the loss of a *ś*, seems not improbable in view of the fact that *Ras*, that is *Spihr*, the Firmament, is regarded as being the source of light (DkM. 124, 18) ; and the lights, Sun, Moon, and stars, are its offspring (DkM. 350, 3, *ras . . . . i-ś zahak 'andar 'hēnd rōšnān χ"aršēt māh 'ut starān*). If only *rōšnīh* had stood in the original text, it would scarcely have been corrupted to the unintelligible form of our present text, but *ras-rōšnīh* written as one word would naturally lead to corruption. Against the emendation must be set the fact that *Ras* does not elsewhere occur except in the *Dēnkart*.

(7-15) Cf. Gr.Bd. 222, 16 ff. ‘ē ‘pat ‘ān *hangām* ‘hač *mēnōk i zamīk ast*, ‘hač ‘āp χōn, ‘hač *urvar mōd*, ‘ut ‘hač vāt \*‘jān čēyōn-šān ‘pat bun-dahišn ‘patiyräft, ‘χ"ādām. nazdist ast ‘ān i *Gayō(k)mart* ‘ul *hangēzēt*, ‘pas ‘ān i *Mašyā* ‘ut *Mašyānē* ‘ut ‘pas ‘ān i *apārīk* ‘kasān ‘ul *hangēzēnēt*. “For at that time I summon the bone from the earth, the blood from the water, the hair from the plants, and the life (breath-soul) from the wind even as they received them at the primal creation. First he raises up the bones of *Gayōmart*, then those of *Mašyā* and *Mašyānē*, and then he raises up those of the other people.” Cf. Phl.Riv. 48, 55.

(16) *dīdišn* : written 𐭠𐭫𐭦 (dahišn, ĥahišn). Reading *dahišn*, we could take it as object to *dānam*, but that leaves us with the scarcely admissible *pat rōšn*. After *pat rōšn* we expect the equivalent of *mēnišnīh*, cf. *pat rōšn-mēnišnīh* in the following line. *dydšn* is well attested in MPT. (Salemann, ManSt. i, s.v.: Andreas-Henning, MirMan. ii and iii), but in Phl. we would expect the spelling *dytšnw* as in *āmōxtišn*. The reading must be regarded as uncertain.

*čēyōn kaδ mart šīr . . . . ku-m katār asp*: the whole passage seems corrupt. *kaδ šīr dōx̄t* has obviously been displaced, and there is reason to believe that other displacements have also taken place, for in the parallel passage PhlRiv. 22, 4, *yāmak* is used not in the simile of the horses but in that of the milk in the sense of “bowl”, not of “garment, caparison”. Though I believe our text needs radical restoration, I have not succeeded in finding a satisfactory rearrangement. I append the *Rivāyat* passage:—

*Ōhrmazd guſt 'ku-m dānākīh ētōn 'hast i 'kaδ hamāk pēm i 'har 'čiš 'andar 'ō yāmak-ē dōſēnd*, [i] 'man ēvak ēvak yutākīhā 'bē 'dānam guſt 'ku \*'hač pistān i 'kē: 'ut 'kaδ hamāk 'āp i 'pat gēhān 'andar 'ō \*ē gyāk 'hilēnd, ēvak ēvak yutāk 'bē 'dānam guſtan 'ku 'hač katār xānīk: 'ut 'kaδ hamāk urvar i 'pat hamāk gēhān χ<sup>v</sup>art 'bē aþsārēnd, ēvak ēvak 'apāč 'ō gyāk <i>'χ<sup>v</sup>es 'dānam 'nihātān.

“Ohrmazd said, ‘My wisdom is such that when they milk all the milk of everything into one bowl, of every single one separately I can say from whose udder it is: and when they pour all the water on the earth into one place, of every single drop I can say from which source it is: and when they pound up small all the plants on all the world, I can put every single one back in its proper place.’”

*dōx̄t*: “milked,” pres. *dōs-* < \**dōχs-* (Bailey, *Philological Society's Transactions*, 1936, p. 101). Cf. DkM. 607, 21, *'avēšān 'gāv dōs*. *Ibid.*, 622, 8, *drang* <i> 10 *asp pēm dōsišn 'kē dōsītar ēvak 'bavēt*, “For so long as it takes to milk the milk of ten mares for which there is one milker.” So *ibid.* lines 12–13, where *dōsišn* is misspelt **دوشن**, and lines 16–17. Cf. *ibid.*, 672, 9, *dōsīt*: 768, 15, *dōsišn*. The form *dōst* found DkM. 608, 2, is probably to be emended to *dōsīt*. The part. *dōx̄t* is also found, GrBd. 104, 13, *šīr i 'gāv dōx̄t* and *ibid.*, 233, 2. The pres. form *dōs-* is also attested Zs. 30, 58, *pēm frāč dōsīhēt*. Cf. NP. دوغ، “buttermilk,” Skt. *kāma-duh-*, “the cow of plenty.”

(19) *gašnak* (?) : دنیسرو ( ): the following passages attest the meaning “small”:—

(i) DkM. 100, 19. 'ut 'kē 'ēn-ič 'nēst, aš *gašnak* (?) *zīvišnīh pahлом 'ku 'mā 'pat vēš-zīvišnīh 'pat tuhīkīh i 'hač pahломīh vināsāt, 'rasāt 'ō vattom rādēnišnīh i 'hast druvandīh*, “For him who does not possess these (qualities), a short life is best, so that, being devoid of perfection and living a long life he may not sin and come to the worst condition which is damnation.” Cf. l. 13 of the same page.

(ii) *Ibid.*, 293, 11. *gašnak*(?)-*mēnišnīh panīh*, “small-minded”

miserliness," is contrasted with *'vazurg-nikīrišnīhā rātīh* "large-minded generosity" (l. 7).

(iii) *Ibid.*, 804, 17. *'ēn-ič 'ku-t zamānak i nēvakīh [i] gašnak(?) 'būt 'ut 'ān i anākīh drāž 'hast*, "This too that the time of your prosperity was short and that of your misery long."

(iv) *Ibid.*, 808, 4. *anāk 'tō tan i sēzōmand 'kē tar gašnak (?) kart 'kē tar nazdīk 'rasēnīt 'ham ō 'ān i vattom aχ<sup>v</sup>ān*, "Wretched is thy perishable body which now is made mean, and brings me near to the worst abodes." Contrasted with this is *ibid.*, 807, 20, *nēvak 'tō 'bavāt 'ēt tan i sēzōmand 'kē tar buland kart 'ham 'kē tar nazdīk [i 'ut] 'rasēnīt 'ham ō 'ān i pahlom aχ<sup>v</sup>ān*, "May thy perishable body prosper thee which now is exalted and now brings me to the perfect abodes." Cf. *ibid.*, 808, 6; 858, 16; 865, 13; 793, 1. Further the word translates Av. *mərəzu-* "short".

If the meaning is abundantly clear, the reading is not. Against Nyberg's *āhūk* < OP. \**āθu-ka* (*J.A.*, 1931, p. 120) must be set the DkM. reading which has *GŠ* clearly, and, more cogently, that of the facsimile K<sub>20</sub> 170 V 20, 82 V 5, and 153 V 19 with pointed *G Š*. Hence the readings *gšnk*, *gšwk* seem alone probable. Any connection with Parth. *gš-*, as with NP. *gāš*, is, however, semantically unacceptable. I would, therefore, take *gašnak* to be a diminutive of *gašan*, NP. *گش* "numerous", cf. *andak*, "small" from *and*, "so much." *gašan* is probably to be read in *Ayātkār i Žāmāspīk*, 14, 11; 16, 41 (Pārsī text *dahan—sipāh u dahān = spāh i gašan* "a numerous army").

(20) The twelve things that were more difficult to create than the Rejuvenation are also found in PhlRiv. 52 and GrBd. 221, 14. PhlRiv. is the exacter parallel to Zs. The following table may be of service:—

<i>Zātspram.</i>	<i>Rivāyat.</i>	<i>Greater Bundahišn.</i>
(i) <i>āsmān astūn.</i>	<i>āsmān.</i>	<i>āsmān apēstūn.</i>
(ii) <i>zamīk.</i>	<i>zamīk.</i>	<i>zamīk.</i>
(iii) <i>χ<sup>v</sup>aršēt.</i>	<i>χ<sup>v</sup>aršēt.</i>	<i>χ<sup>v</sup>aršēt, māh 'ut</i>
(iv) <i>māh.</i>	<i>māh.</i>	<i>stārak.</i>
(v) . . . . .	<i>star.</i>	
(vi) <i>andar urvarān vas gōnak rang ut *čāšišn.</i>	<i>yavartāk i χōšak.</i>	<i>yavartāk.</i>
(vii) <i>andar urvar ātaχš.</i>	<i>andar urvarīhā gōnak bōd ut mičak.</i>	<i>andar urvar rang gōnak gōnak.</i>
(viii) <i>χōšak.</i>	<i>andar urvar ātaχš.</i>	<i>urvarān ātaχš.</i>

<i>Zātspram.</i>	<i>Rivāyat.</i>	<i>Greater Bundahišn.</i>
(ix) <i>andar mātakān</i>	<i>andar aškomb i māta-</i>	<i>andar burtār i māt</i>
<i>zahak.</i>	<i>rān pus.</i>	<i>pus.</i>
(x) <i>tanōmand murvān</i>	<i>murv.</i>	<i>ō āp pād dāt.</i>
<i>pat parr.</i>		
(xi) <i>āp pād dāt.</i>	<i>āp pat ravišn dāt.</i>	<i>aþr.</i>
(xii) <i>aþr.</i>	<i>aþr.</i>	<i>Vāy.</i>

*zartak i χāyak miyān i χāyak.* Cf. Mχ. 44, 7 ; PhlRiv. 46, 5 ; DkM. 64, 7. GrBd. 18, 4, *nazdist āsmān 'dāt rōšn paytāk i* (thus P) *apēr dūr*  : for these signs the Paris MS. has . The reading of TD<sub>2</sub> certainly indicates *dūr-kanārak* “whose borders are far apart”, the most frequent of all epithets of the sky, but the reading of P seems to represent *χāyak-dēs* “in the form of an egg”. I would therefore suggest that in both there is a lacuna, TD<sub>2</sub> omitting *χāyak* and P *kanārak*.  in TD is to be read *dēs* as in GrBd. 41, 3, *dēs <i> vazag* (written ); so also in the concluding section of our chapter. The restored text should therefore read *dūr-kanārak χāyak-dēs*.

The Pahlavī books merely speak of the sky as being like an egg : they do not speak of it as actually being an egg. This doctrine, which Plutarch seems to attribute to the Magians (*de Iside*, 46 ; Clemen, *Fontes*, p. 48 ; Bidez-Cumont, *Les Mages hellénisés*, ii, D 4, p. 71 ; Benveniste, *The Persian Religion*, pp. 71, 100), and which Benveniste following Darmesteter discerned in the *Mēnōk i Xrat*, is not only unknown in Pahlavī but condemned as absurd ; for the *Šikand Gumānī Vazār*, 5, 36, says : *han āinaa i ež īn bēruñ añdar vīmañd [i] ačārī nə būt nə šāyat*, *čuñ kə gōeł ku gēhāq pa nihānī añdar añdaruñ χāeae burdan šāyat*, “Another sort different from this necessarily cannot be within the province (of possibility, *šāyat sažət būdan*, §§ 31, 33), as when one says that the world could be brought into the interior of an egg.” As a similar absurdity the author goes on to quote the statement of Jesus that it is possible for a camel to go through a needle’s eye. We may therefore be certain that the conception of the Cosmic Egg is foreign to Mazdeanism proper ; nor can it be pleaded in this connection that the account of the *Mēnōk*, being Zervanite in tendency, implies such a doctrine, for that account is precisely similar to that of the *Dēnkart*, and the *Dēnkart* in an earlier recension was one of the principal authorities of the *Šikand* (ŠGV.,

introduction, p. xviii). All Pahlavī sources confine themselves to the comparison.

*kaδ star brēhēnīt*: restored from the parallel Riv. passage, v. *supra*. Though TD leaves a lacuna before the ninth creation and numbers accordingly, the presence of “the stars” in our two parallel passages makes our restoration almost certain.

\*čāšišn: NP. چاشنی, چاشنے, “taste,” “midday meal”, چشیدن “taste”, etc. The emendation is again suggested by the *Rivāyat* parallel *mičak*, cf. Phl. Texts, p. 122, § 7, *mičak i čāšnīk*. The ۱۳۰۷ of the text can, however, be retained: we should then read *paxsišn*, “ripening.” Cf. MPersT. *pχš-* “ripen” (MirMan. i, s.v.). NP. attests both Pers. and Parth. چشیدن beside پخسیدن. For the Parth. formation with *s* in Phl. we may compare *tafsīt* (GrBd. 73, 9).

ārōdišn: translates Av. *uruθa-*, *uruθmya-*, also *raod-* (Vd. 6, 6), cf. MPT. *'ruv* “Gewächse” (MirMan. i).

*tāk bē <nē> viturt*: the addition *nē* is made certain by Yt. 13, 11. *vīdāraēm . . . azēm barəθrišva puθrē paiti vərətē apara iriθintō*.

*drēm*: v. BSOS., IX, p. 901.

*srūv*: transliteration of Av. *srū-*.

*aþr dāt*: supplied from the parallels, v. *supra*.

(24) *pat čand*: a substantive seems to have fallen out, probably *aþzār*, as in the corrupt GrBd. 4, 4. *zamān* would also be possible.

*pātēmār*: written with the ideogram *PKDN*. Cf. FrPhl. Junker, p. 56, and index, p. 122. Whatever the juridical meaning may be—and MhD. ii, 36, 2, and *ibid.*, i, 100, 15 (despite Pagliaro’s discussion, RSO., xi, p. 470), are not clear to me—Junker’s “judiciaries, judgment; punishment” does not seem very satisfactory. The following passages seem to demand the translation “appointed”, as does our own.

(i) AVM., § 127 (Phl. Texts, p. 95): *tuxšāk[īh] 'ān 'kē pēšak i frārōnīh 'kunēt, 'ut kār-ič i pātēmār 'bavēt, avināsīhā 'ut aranājākīhā pat-iš tuxšēt*, “The vigorous man is he who does the trade of righteousness, and without sin or trouble perseveres in the work which is appointed for him.”

(ii) GrBd. 180, 13. *'ēn mēnōkān 'vas nāmčištīk kār ov-iš pātēmār*, “These spirits have many special works assigned to them.”

(iii) ŠGV. 5, 60–2. *əduñniča vāspuhargānī u čiharanādaī i añdamāq i añdarūnī, čuñ ſigar dawur* (for چهار, دوچار, *spuhl* “spleen”, cf.

Zs. 30, 15 ; 16, 30 ; PhlRiv. 59, 3 ; GrBd. 190, 1 ; **دَرْعَةٌ** : 195, 2 (درعه) **کَارِيَّه** : 195, 2 (کاریه)  
*suš gurdaa u zahar-pōšašni awar̄ awazār̄ kə har yak ažašq χ"ōškāriē pōdā : hawašq pādimāl čiharanīt vāspuhargānīt əstəñd pa q i yašq χ"ōš kār*, “So too is the governing and natural regulation of the internal organs such as the liver, spleen, lungs, kidneys, gall-bladder, and the other organs, every one of which has its own function which is appointed to it and governed and regulated according to its individual work.” For this passage Pagliaro (*loc. cit.*) suggested “difesa, protezione”.

The meaning seems further corroborated by a passage from the *Nīrangistān* quoted by Bartholomæ, AIW., col. 828 : *nē pātēmārakān kað-aš bahr andar nē bavēt*, “not appointed, that is when it has not its proper part.”

For Syriac **پُو** Brockelmann gives “quae sicut, ultus est, punivit, mandavit, jussit”. “mandavit” gives the sense we require. Our word is presumably to be connected with Phl. *pēšēmār* and *pasēmār* (cf. Nyberg, *Glossar*, p. 185). *-ēmār* < *aði* + *mar-* “mark out”. For the initial *pāt-* cf. *pātdahišn*, *pātkōs*, *pātzahr*, *pātrazm*, etc. (cf. Bartholomæ, Zum AIW., p. 180).

(25) *spēžišn*, v. BSOS., IX, p. 311. In the Persian Manichæan texts *yyšw* ‘*spyx̄t'n* is equivalent to the Jesus-Zīwā of Theodore bar Kônai (“Jésus le lumineux”, Cumont, *Recherches*, i, p. 46 : “Jesus the luminous,” Jackson, *Researches*, p. 249), v. Waldschmidt-Lentz, *Stellung Jesu*, pp. 36 and 38. According to DkM. 264, 19, sacrifice to the Creator is the *spēžišn* of the Creator, *ēžišn i dātār i 'χ"at spēžišn i dātār*.

(28) *vinīrišn* : MPT. *wynyr-* “gedeihen, glücklich werden”: with *'br* “bereitet werden”. v. Henning, ManBBB., p. 116. DkM. 170, 2, *ham-'bavišnīh*, *vinīrišn* (*WN' YLŠN W*) ‘ut \*daštakīh—“conception, growth, and becoming a foetus.”

*nīsārk* : if our word is genuine, it must be connected with Parth. *nys'r'd* “begun” (Lentz, *Stellung Jesu*, p. 114, M 855 V O : Andreas-Henning, MirMan., iii).

*spēžihēnd* : cf. § 25. For the meaning “shoot forth” cf. Zs. 30, 55, *urvar karpān dūr-bōd nīhāl viškōβ spēžihēnd*, “the forms of plants, fragrant afar, saplings, and blossom shoot forth.” So Andreas-Henning, MirMan., i, p. 190, *dr̄xt 'spzynd*, “the trees put forth shoots.”

(30) This and the following section deal with Ějh, the Primal Whore. The *Bundahišn* (GrBd. 39, 12–41, 10) gives a fuller account

of the Īēh episode, which Professor Benveniste has analysed in his brilliant study of Theodore bar Kōnai's account of Zoroastrianism (MO., xxvi, pp. 170–215). The *Bundahišn* unfortunately is not entirely clear, and our *Zātspram* passage is fragmentary and corrupt. The present attempt at restoration must therefore be regarded as tentative.

*bānūk aβdist*: the text has **॥ରୂପାଶ୍ଵାସ**, for which Anklesaria suggested the emendation **॥ରୂପାଶ୍ଵାସ hanbāzastan**. This is not very satisfactory, for *hanbāzihast* would be the correct form, and it has already been stated that Īēh was Ahriman's companion in his assault on the creation of Ohrmazd. *bānūk aβdist* seems probable on two grounds: (i) the following clause, *χ'at hast sar i hamāk īēh-dēvān*, "verily she is the chief of all whore demons," gains in point as explaining *bānūk*; (ii) the appointment of Īēh as queen of her kind is paralleled by the similar appointment of Āz as the captain of Ahriman's hosts.

*aβdist*: cf. MParthT. *'bdys-*, *'bdyšt* "weisen, belehren" (MirMan., iii; Salemann, ManSt., i). It is difficult to point to certain parallels in Phl., as the word is constantly confused with *apāyast*; but DkM. 127, 20, seems a case in point: *yazat mānāk i dānāk huχ'atāy 'mart i ahrov i \*andar gētēh Ōhrmazd dēsak (ଓଡ଼ିଆ)* *aβdistan gōbēt*, "God is like a wise, good, and holy ruler who preaches the demonstration of the form of Ohrmazd on earth." DkM. 161, 22, and 162, 2, 5, 8, may also be cited, but no certain meaning can be attached to **ଇତ୍ତବୁଦ୍ଧି**. I shall therefore be content with quoting the first: *'pat ruvān-bižiškīh 'ut rāst tarškāy Ašvahišt amahraspand \*sačāk aβdistīh*, "In the healing of the soul and a righteous and reverent teaching (?) suitable to the Amahraspand Artvahišt." One might, however, prefer to read *aβdast* < *aβi* + *dasta-* which would then mean "dexterity". DkM. 887, 2, has *kām 'ut framān 'ut aβdist* with the diacritical mark over *d*, but the following line has *kār framān apāyast*. In our own passage we might also read *\*apāyast* and translate: "He needed the demon Whore of evil religion, the queen of her species, that is the chief of all the whore demons."

(31) After *dušdēn*, *īēh-dēv* has fallen out, as is obvious from the preceding section. The question is, has anything else fallen out, and if so what? We learn that Īēh had sexual intercourse with someone unnamed, and that she did so to defile females, by which presumably women are meant. Now if she had intercourse with Ahriman it is difficult to see how she was thereby to defile women, and the same

applies to Āz. Zurvān and Ohrmazd can safely be left out of our inquiry both on the grounds stated and because such an inherently preposterous idea, unattested elsewhere, must necessarily be dismissed. The only other person present at this stage of the cosmic drama is the Blessed Man, and by having intercourse with him she might justly consider that she would thereby defile the future race of women. Leaving aside Theodore and the fourth chapter of the *Bundahišn* for the moment, we find striking support for our theory in GdBd. 107, 14–108, 7. The passage is worth quoting *in extenso* : *guft-aš Ōhrmazd 'kād-aš 'zan brēhēnīt, 'ku 'dāt-ič-am 'hēh, 'tō 'kē-t ſēhān sardak pityār, 'ut-at nazdīk 'kūn 'ut 'dahān ē 'dāt 'hēh, 'kē-t māyišn ētōn 'sahēt čēyōn 'pat 'dahān mičak-ē <i>x<sup>a</sup>rišn <i>xirēntom, \*'kē-m 'tō adyārīh, 'čē-t 'mart hač-iš 'zāt, 'man-ič āzārēh \*'kē Ōhrmazd 'ham. 'bē 'hakar-am vindāt 'hēt yāmak 'kē 'mart hač-iš 'kunam, am 'nē \*'dāt 'hēt hakarč 'kē-t 'ān i ſēh sardak pityārak.* 'bē-m 'x<sup>v</sup>ast 'andar 'āp 'ut zamīk 'ut urvar 'ut gōspand, bālist garān 'ān-ič i zufr [t] rōtstāk : 'nē 'vindāt yāmak 'kē 'mart i ahrov hač-iš 'būt yut 'zan \*'kē ſēh pityārak, “ And Ohrmazd said when he created woman, ‘ I created thee, thou whose adversary is the whore species, and thou wast with thy mouth near to the sexual organs, and coition seems to thee even as the taste of the sweetest food to the mouth ; and thou art an helper to me, for from thee is man born, and thou dost grieve me who am Ohrmazd. But had I found another vessel from which to make man, never would I have created thee whose adversary is the whore species. But I sought in the waters of the earth, in plants and cattle, in the highest mountains and the deep valleys, but I did not find a vessel from which blessed man might proceed except woman whose adversary is the whore.’ ”

A more obvious and clumsy attempt to adapt an extraneous myth to the Mazdean system could scarcely be found. Ohrmazd, by definition omnipotent and omniscient, is nevertheless incapable of finding a satisfactory means of reproducing mankind. What he succeeds in creating is, in fact, not woman at all but an obscene monster of lubricity “ with her mouth near the sexual organs ”. The monotonous iteration of the formula “ thou whose adversary is the whore species ” in no way conceals the inherent wickedness of this obviously undesirable creature. The author of the *Bundahišn* “ complains too much ”, for it is obvious that this creature “ who grieves Ohrmazd ” was in the original no creature of his : she must have been ſēh herself, the Primal Whore, who is at the same time Primal Woman. Her

function is the reproduction of mankind, and this purpose she could only reasonably effect by cohabiting with Gayōmart, the Blessed Man. Hence our restoration in the *Zātspram* text seems to be justified.

Professor Benveniste (*loc. cit.*) has already drawn the conclusion from the account of Theodore bar Kōnai and GrBd., ch. iv, that woman was a creature of evil in the Zervanite system. But the account of Theodore too exhibits a compromise between the Zervanite and Mazdean points of view, as he rightly points out. Women, created by Ohrmazd, are given to the just men, but with remarkable perversity they at once flee and take refuge with Ahriman. They then wished to have intercourse with the just, that is man, but Ohrmazd contrived an expedient, and made the god Narsē, and placed him naked behind Ahriman "that the women might see him, lust after him, and ask (saying): 'O Satan (Ahriman), our father, give us the god Narsē as a gift'" (cf. Bidez-Cumont, *Les Mages Hellénisés*, ii, p. 105). As we are at present engaged in justifying an emendation in the text of *Zātspram*, we must refrain from discussing Theodore's substitution of Narsē for Gayōmart and refer the reader to Cumont, *Recherches sur le Manichéisme*, i, pp. 61–8. The link between Theodore and *Zātspram* is supplied by GrBd. 40, 14–41, 10 = IndBd. (Justi) 9, 9–13. The Indian version is much shorter, inverts the order of events, and makes no mention of Ohrmazd. The two texts are as follows:—

(i) IndBd. *drāyīt* 'ō *jeħ* 'ku-t 'čē *kāmak*, *tāk-at daham*. 'ut-aš *drāyīt* *jeħ* 'ō *ganāk mēnōk* 'ku 'mart-kāmak*ih* [i] \**bē* 'ō *man* 'dah. *ganāk mēnōk karp dītan d<ē>sak i vazag* [karp]. 'ut-aš 'mart i *yuvān* i 15 'sālak 'ō *jeħ* *mēnišn ov-iš* 'bast. "He (Ahriman) cried out to the Whore, 'What is thy desire that I may give it thee?' And the Whore cried out to the Destructive Spirit, 'Give me desire for man.' The appearance of the body of the Destructive Spirit was the form of a frog. And he showed the Whore a young man of fifteen years of age. The Whore fastened her thoughts on him."

(ii) GrBd. *davīt ganāk mēnōk* 'ō \**jeħ-dēv\** 'ku-t 'čē *kāmak* 'hēt, 'χ"āð, 'tāk-at 'daham. 'aðak Ōhrmazd 'pat *xrat harvisp-ākāsīh* 'dānast 'ku 'pat 'ān zamān 'čē *jeħ-dēv* 'χ"āðēt, *ganāk mēnōk attōk dāt* 'ut-aš 'pat 'ān mas-sūtīh. 'ān *ganāk mēnōk karp* [i] *dītan dēs* {i} *vazag*. 'ut-aš 'mart {i} *yuvān* i 15 'sālak *humānāk* 'ō *jeħ-dēv* *nimūt*. 'ān i *jeħ-dēv* *mēnišn ov-iš* *bast*. 'ut-aš *davīt jeħ-dēv* 'ō *ganāk mēnōk* 'ku 'mart-kāmak*ih* 'ō *man* 'dah, 'ku-š 'pat *sardārīh* 'andar mān 'bē nišēnām. 'ut-aš *davīt ganāk mēnōk* 'ku 'čiš 'χ"āstan 'ō 'tō 'nē 'gōβam, 'čē apē-sūt

((sic) P. ۱۳۰ میں) 'vat 'dānēh 'χ<sup>v</sup>āst. 'be \*sačist (۱۲۷ میں), but cf. ۱۳۰ میں P.) 'ān zamān \*.. kaδ-aš 'če\* ('če 'kaδ-aš MSS.) 'χ<sup>v</sup>āst 'hēt, 'nē attōk 'būt 'hēh 'dātan. “The Evil Spirit cried out to the demon Whore, ‘Ask whatever is thy desire, that I may give it thee.’ Then Ohrmazd in the omniscience of his wisdom knew that at that time the Evil Spirit could give whatever the demon Whore asked, and that there would be great benefit to him (sc. Ohrmazd) thereby. The appearance of the body of the Evil Spirit was the form of a frog. And he (Ohrmazd ? Ahriman ?) showed one like unto a young man of fifteen years of age to the demon Whore ; and the demon Whore fastened her thoughts on him. And the demon Whore cried out to the Destructive Spirit, ‘Give me desire for man, that I may seat him in the house as my lord.’ And the Destructive Spirit cried unto her, ‘I do not bid thee ask anything, for thou knowest (only) to ask for what is without benefit and bad.’ But the time had passed when he had not been able to give what she asked.”

Although various deities are compared to a young man of fifteen years of age, it cannot be doubted that the reference is here to Gayōmart, the Blessed Man, or to the form of sleep that was given him (GrBd. 44, 3). The Bd. does not expressly state that the Whore had intercourse with Gayōmart or with anyone else, as we would expect from Zātspram, but the Bd. passage is only a fragment, and we must look to Zs. for what subsequently took place ; and in Zs. *hamyuxt* is plainly there. The myth is then not strictly comparable to the Manichæan Seduction of the Archons or the unedifying experiences of Hibil-Zīwā with the demoness Zahriēl related in *Ginzā* R., pp. 147–9 (Lidzbarski, pp. 160–2 : Brandt, *Mandäische Schriften*, pp. 156–9), for in neither of these cases is the divine being defiled. There is still much to be said about the Jēh episode, but this cannot now be investigated. It might, however, be suggested that the Jēh myth is a survival of the Magian doctrine preserved in Hippolytus, *Refut. haeres.* i, 2, 12–15 (Bidez-Cumont, op. laud., ii, p. 62 ; Clemen, *Fontes*, p. 76), which regards darkness as the female principle and light as the male.

(32) Āz : must be read rather than *az* “serpent”, that is Dahāk. §§ 36–7, are conclusive. The destructive activities of Dahāk, most fully described in the *Bahman Yašt*, occur in the millennium of Ōšētarmāh, when Karsāsp is resuscitated (ZāmN., ch. xvii, Messina ; GrBd. 219, 15 ff. ; PhlRiv. 48, 30 ff.). The destruction of Āz is the very last stage in the victory of the powers of light over the powers of darkness.

In assigning to Āz the feminine gender I follow the Manichæan texts (S 13, v. Henning, *NGGW.*, 1932, p. 215), where it is called "the accursed mother of all demons". In the Avesta, however, this demon is masculine; it is therefore possible that Āz, like Zurvān, was considered hermaphrodite. The feminine gender of the Manichæan fragments, however, argues a similar state of affairs in Zervanism.

(33) *gašnak* : v. 19 n.

(34) \**apārikān-ič* : the *apārik-ič-ān* of the MS. is probably not genuine, and *apārikān-ič* should be read. *katār-ič-ē* is not strictly comparable. One can scarcely compare the strange form **𐭠𐭃**, (*zimčik*, -čik as in Soghd.) attested DkM. 404, 17, *hamēnik* 'ut *zimčik*, "of summer and winter." *Ibid.* 298, 3, *zimčik uzēnak* corresponds to *zimastān uzēnak* in 299, 12, cf. 683, 9; 769, 11. For 404, 17, Nyberg read *nēmčik* (*Texte zum Mazdayasnischen Kalender*, p. 38), but the parallel passages prove that the meaning "winter" is required.

(35) \**patmōk* . . . *zāy* : the object given by Zurvān to Ahriman is a "garment" or a "weapon". Similarly Augustine (*contra Faustum*, xi, 3), speaks of the panoply of the Manichæan Primal Man as *membra sua vel vestimenta sua, vel arma sua, id est quinque elementa* (Baur, *Das Manichäische Religionssystem*, p. 54).

(37) *rēčak patrāk* : "emitting and receiving," obviously in a sexual connotation. With this specialized use of *rēč-* I would connect *rēčišn* "lust" (against *BSOS.*, IX, p. 316). The intermediate stage between *rēčišn* "emitting" and "lust" is to be found in DkM. 442, 22. *kūn-marz yātūkīh, rāsdārīh* 'ut 'zan-\**rēčih* (**𐭠𐭃**). The meaning "lust" is clearly attested DkM. 233, 7, where *rēčišn* 'ō *dušgōhrān*, "lust for evil-natured people," is opposed to line 1, *āhang* 'ō *hugōhrān*, "longing for good-natured people." *Ibid.*, 82, 10, *gađōk rēčišn* is opposed to *bayān ož*. *Ibid.*, 687, 9, *rēčišnīh* 'ut *anākīh* 'hač 'dēvān. The sense of "pouring forth" of evil is found, *ibid.*, 119, 2, 'andar 'dēvān *rēčišn i hač-išān pityārak* 'ō *gēhān vināsišn* 'ut *vizand i dāmān*, "in the demons pouring forth their opposition for the damage of the world and detriment of creatures"; *ibid.*, 257, 7, *aydēn adātīh* 'hač 'dēvān 'pat frēþ *rēčišn*, "the lawlessness of evil religion is from the demons pouring forth deceit," cf. *ibid.*, 263, 7.

(38) \**čārgarīh* : the *čihrgarīh* of the MS. is plainly wrong, as the čār i Āz *χʷāðīhēt* of § 34 shows.

*Artvahišt* : for the descent of Artvahišt on to the earth cf. PhlRiv. 48, 20; DkM. 669, 16 ff. It takes place in the millennium of Ōšētar.

*frāč pat nūn* : the reading seems assured by the parallels. PhlRiv. 48, 20, has *čeyōn 'nūn kušt 'hēt* ; DkM., loc. cit., has *čeyōn 'ān pēš 'bē kuštār 'būt 'hēt*.

(39) \**nērōk* : for the *nkyrwkw* of the MS. we may also read *kirrōk*, “skill,” but § 40 has *nērōk*.

(39–41) The stages by which men cease to eat are described somewhat more fully in DkM. 673, 13 ff.: *'martōm apē-niyāzīh i 'hač 'gōst rād 'gōst-χ'arišnīh 'hilēnd, 'ut-šān χ'arišn pēm 'ut urvar 'bavēt : 'ut 'kað 3 'sāl 'mānd 'estēt, pēm-χ'arišnīh-ič 'hilēnd*, “Because they do not need meat, men will cease to eat meat, and their food will be milk and plants ; and when three years remain, they will cease to drink milk also” ; *ibid.* 675, 17, 17 *'sāl urvar-χ'arišn*, 30 *'sāl 'āp-χ'arišn*, 10 *'sāl mēnōk-χ'arišn*, “For sixteen years their food shall be plants, for thirty years water, and for ten years their food shall be spiritual.”

(42) *ruzdakīhā* : (رُزْدَكِهَ), v. Bailey, *BSOS.*, VI, p. 82. NP. رُزْد and رُزْد : MPT. *rwdyst* “gierig werden nach” (MirMan., ii, iii, cf. Salemann, ManSt., i, s.v.). In Pahlavī the normal spelling is 𐭩𐭪𐭫, cf. Dd. 5, 7 ; DkM. 506, 7 ; 233, 10 (لُوْبِدِي).

*hanburt* : <*par-* “fill”, cf. Vd. 4, 48, where *ham hanbārēt* translates Av. *ham-pāfrāti*.

(42–5) A somewhat fuller account is given in PhlRiv. 48, 90–6. \**Ēšm* 'ut *Āz* 'bē 'ō *ganāk mēnōk* 'gōbēt 'ku *dusdānāk ganāk mēnōk*, 'bē 'tō *žōyam*, 'cē-t 'bē 'hač 'tō *dām* 'graft : <'nē> *ganj* 'nē-\*ič *gund* (a) 'ut 'man *zīvastan* 'nē *tavān*. (91) *fratom Āz i 'dēvān-dāt* 'bē \**žōyēt* (ژویت) *Ēšm i xurdruš*, 'ut *ditīkar zimastān i 'dēvān-dāt*, 'ut *sitīkar Sēz* i *nihān-ravišn*, 'ut 4-om *Zarmān* i\**dušdaft* (b) 'bē \**žōyēt* 'tāk *hēč-ē frāč mānēnd* (92) <'bē 'hač> (c) *ganāk mēnōk* 'ut *Āz i 'dēvān-dāt*. 'gōbēt *Āz i 'dēvān-dāt* 'bē 'ō *ganāk mēnōk* 'ku 'bē 'tō *žōyam*, *dusdānāk*, 'cē *yazdān* 'bē 'hač 'tō *dām* \**graft*. (93) *ganāk mēnōk* 'ul *estēt*, 'bē 'ō *Spēnāk Mēnōk* 'šavēt, 'ētōn \**davēt* (داویت) 'ku 'man 'ēn *dām* 'dāt 'ut *Āz i 'dēvān-dāt* 'kē-š *dām* <i> 'man žūt, 'nūn 'man 'bē 'kāmēt žūtan : 'tō 'pat *dātaBarīh* 'kunam. (94) *Ōhrmazd* 'apāk *Srōš ahrov* 'ul *estēt* 'ut *Srōš-ahrāy[īh]* *Āz* 'bē 'zanēt, *Ōhrmazd* *ganāk mēnōk*. (95) 'apāk \**spistēn*(?) (d) *tārīkīh* 'ut *anākīh* <i> 'fratom 'kað 'andar *duvārast* 'andar ābūrt, *hamāk* 'pat *sūrāk* 'ku 'andar *duvārast*, *bērōn* *āsmān* \**kart*, 'ut-aš <'pat> 'ān *sūrāk* 'ētōn start 'ut *abōd* 'bē 'kart i 'pas 'hač 'ān *sturtīh* 'apāč <'nē> *estēt*. (96) *būt*

'*kē-š guft 'ku yāvētānakān 'pat 'ōzanišn advēnak akār 'bē 'kart, 'nē 'pas ganā<k> mēnōk 'bavēt, 'nē 'ān i 'avē dām.*

“ Ešm (Anger) and Āz say to the Destructive Spirit, ‘ O thou Destructive Spirit of evil knowledge, I shall swallow thee, for except thee all creation has been taken away, \*and there is neither treasure nor army\*, and I cannot live.’ (91) First Āz, the demon-created, swallows Ešm of the bloody spear, and second the demon-created Winter, and third Bane (*sēž*) that moves in secret, and fourth she swallows Old Age whose breath is foul, so that none remain (92) save the Destructive Spirit and Āz, the demon-created. Āz, the demon-created, says to the Destructive Spirit, ‘ I will swallow thee, O thou of evil knowledge, for the gods have taken away (all) creation save thee.’ (93) The Destructive Spirit rises up and goes towards the Bounteous Spirit, and cries out thus, ‘ I created this creation, and Āz, the demon-created, who has swallowed my creation, now desires to swallow me ; I make thee judge (over us).’ (94) Ohrmazd arises with Srōš, the Blessed, and Srōš, the Blessed, smites Āz, and Ohrmazd the Destructive Spirit. (95) With the foul (?) darkness and misery which he brought into (the world) when he first rushed in, he is entirely thrown out of the sky through the hole by which he rushed in ; and at that hole he is laid low and made unconscious so that he will (never) again arise from that low estate. (96) There have been some who have said that he will be forever powerless and as it were slain, and that henceforth neither the Destructive Spirit nor his creation will exist.”

(a) Text Reading uncertain.

(b) *dušdaft* : v. Bailey, *BSOS.*, VI, p. 597 ; Benveniste, MO., xxvi, p. 179.

(c) '*bē 'hač* : a necessary addition, cf. '*bē 'hač 'tō dām* at the end of the section.

(d) : emendation after Dhabhar, who compares NP. سیست. I have found no parallel in Pahlavī.

Cf. also ZāmN. 17, 13 (Messina). I quote Messina’s restoration of the text and add an asterisk where I diverge from him : *čērād Ahriaman ū Āz drāyēt ku šav, tō hamāk dēv ut druž, xrafstar ut dām i man bē χ<sup>v</sup>ar. Āz dēv šavēt, hamāk dām ut dahišn i Ahriaman bē \*ōβārēt (a) <gōbēt), tō-m čē ? gōbēm-at\* ku nē sēr ham. pas Āz dēv ut Ahriaman \*nizār-tavān (b) bavēt*, “ For Ahriaman cries out to Āz (saying), ‘ Go, devour all the

demons and lies, noxious beasts and my creation.' The demon Āz goes and swallows all the creation of Ahriman (and says), 'What art thou to me: I say unto thee that I am not satisfied.' Then the power of the demon Āz and Ahriman is weakened."

(a) The Pāzand has *hyārət̪*. Messina *χ̄arēt̪*.

(b) Pāz. *u zār* must represent Phl. *𐭂𐭃* = *nizār*.

*baxtīk* (*bxtyk*, *bxtykw*, *bxtyk*): the context shows that the meaning is "ally" or something similar. I can point to no certain parallel in Pahlavī, but DkM. 124, 16, may be compared where the text has *bxtkw*: *gētēh-dahišnān pahлом 'martōm 'andar 'martōmān 'avē i huχ<sup>w</sup>atāy dahyupat bunist i [i] gēhān baxt*<ī*k i hugar rōšn dātār nazdīm*, "Of earthly creatures the perfect man is the provincial governor who rules well among men, the foundation of the world and the ally who is nearest to the beneficent light creator."

(48) *pat zamīk paytāk bavēt*: Airyaman must here be taken as an epithet of Sōšyans, as the verb is singular. Cf. MPT, *'ry'm'n* as an epithet of Jesus.

(49) \**gað advēnak*: reading conjectural. The text has **۱۹۰۴۲۱۱۱**, which will yield no sense.

(50) Creation by water: cf. GrBd. 17, 4, *fratom dām hamāk 'āp-ē srišk-ē būt* ((sic) P), *'ku hamāk 'hač 'āp 'būt yut tōhm i 'martōmān 'ut gōspandān*, *'če 'ān tōhm ātaxš-tōhm*, "The first creation was all a drop of water, for all was from water except the seed of men and beasts, for that seed is of the seed of fire."

*Ibid.*, 189, 4, *gētēh 'hač 'āp-ē srišk kart 'estēt*: *čeγōn 'gōbēt 'ku 'ēn dām fratom hamāk 'āp-ē srišk 'būt, martōmān-ič 'hač 'āp-ē srišk hamē 'būt*, "The material world was made from a drop of water; as it is said that this creation was all at first a drop of water, and men too, arose from a drop of water."

A different account is found in DkM. 79, 21, *'har-ič gētēhīk 'bavišn pazzāmišn vīnārišn 'hač hamīh 'pat patmān <i>'āp i māt<ak> 'ut ātur i 'nar 'pat ham-žahišnīh*: *'χ̄āh 'ut brāt hangārīhēnd*, "Every material becoming, ripening, and cause of progress is from the union according to the mean of water, the female, and fire, the male, in their coming together: they are considered brother and sister."

(50) *pātēr<ān>gar*: this word has been fully discussed by Bartholomæ (*Zum sass. Recht*, ii, pp. 31-4). After a thorough analysis of his data he arrived at the conclusion that the root meaning was "retinere". For DkM. 708, 1, he translated "Suspendierung" (*ibid.*,

iv, p. 28), and for MhD., ii, 8, 9, "Zurücklegung" (*ibid.*, iii, p. 10). In all of this he was right. The Pāz. *pādirā* occurring in ŠGV. 16, 26 and 41, was translated by Salemann "zurück leiten, hin dirigieren" (*Bruchstück manichaeischen Schrifttums*, St. Petersburg, 1904, p. 26), by Jackson (*Researches in Manichaeism*, p. 191) "forced back," by Henning, who connected it with NP. 𐭂ܰܲܰܲ, "stützen" or "zurückhalten" (*OLZ.*, 1934, p. 755), and by Nyberg "zurückstellen" (to DkM. 275, 20, *Texte zum mazdayasnischen Kalender*, p. 43). The meanings "prevent, hold back, obstruct" will be found to cover most examples.

Again and again the word is used in connection with or opposed to *ravākīh*. *ravākīh* is orderly progress, *pātērānīh* what obstructs or holds it up. The following examples will serve to illustrate its use:—

DkM. 141, 20. '*hač gētēh pātuχšāyīh \*hanj̄aftakīh mēnōk dēn pātērān-ravākīh*, "From the collapse (?) of material kingship (follows) the obstruction of the onward flow of spiritual religion."

*Ibid.*, 247, 21. *kirpak pātērānēnāk 'ut bazak ravākēnāk*, "Obstructing virtue and promoting vice."

*Ibid.*, 316, 3. '*ōh-ič 'sax'an-'gōβ frazānak 'pat a 'rasišnīh 'i-š 'sax'an-šnās niyō(k)sītār pātērān-sūtīh i 'hač sax'an*', "Thus a wise speaker of words, if his words do not reach a listener who understands words, has the benefit of his words obstructed." *pātērān-sūtīh* is opposed to the *sūt-ravākīh* of 315, 23.

*Ibid.*, 396, 21. '*pat zartuχštō(k)tomān 'χ'arr \*ānāβišn dēn māzdēsn ravākīh pātērānīhāt*', "By the destruction of the fortune of the *zartuš-tōtom* the progress of the Mazdayasnian religion is obstructed." So also *ibid.*, 341, 20.

The following examples may also be of use:—

DkM. 84, 2. '*ku pat-iš ēihr-rādēnītārīh 'mā pātērānīhāt, dām ravākīh 'mā 'bandīhāt*', "That the regulation of nature might not be obstructed and the progress of creation might not be stopped."

*Ibid.*, 88, 10. '*nē hēč 'čiš i āhangēnāk martōm 'ō vinās pātērānēnāk 'hač kirpak 'dāt*', "He created nothing that attracted men to vice and held them back from virtue."

*Ibid.*, 351, 9. *pātērānīh χ'aršēt 'hač ravišn*, "preventing the Sun from moving."

GrBd, 57, 11. '*ut-šān Ōhrmazd 'ut Anāhīt 'hač vinās kartan pātērā-nēnīt*', "And they prevented the planets Jupiter and Venus from doing harm."

For the correct rendering of the ŠGV. passages and the Avestan

words translated by *pātērān* the reader is referred to Bartholomæ, *oc. cit.* I add the following references from the Dk. : (i) adj. *pātērān* and subst. *pātērānīh* : DkM. 112, 8 ; 141, 18 ; 176, 4 ; 344, 2 ; 372, 8 ; 391, 8 ; 423, 4 ; 463, 22 ; 711, 8 ; 744, 7 ; 770, 11, 16, 21 ; 771, 2 ; 877, 4 ; (ii) verb *pātērānēn-*, *pātērānīh-* : DkM. 168, 2 ; 175, 15 ; 275, 20 ; 343, 6 ; 396, 21 ; 704, 15 ; 706, 15 ; 708, 1 ; 714, 14 ; 769, 10, 14, 18, 21 ; 767, 3 ; 771, 8.

Jackson's etymology *pāti* + *rān-* does not seem to me impossible : *pāt-* as a prefix is amply attested in MP. Dr. Henning (*loc. cit.*), denying that a prefix *pāti-* ever existed, regarded the verbal form as a denominative from NP. پایزه "Stützbalken", but this is semantically unacceptable. "Act as a supporting beam to" is scarcely the same as "obstruct". The occasional spelling لعسون سرمه (DkM. 141, 18 ; 711, 7 ; 714, 14) suggests the reading *pātērān* (rather than *pātirān*) with preverbs *pāti* + *ađi*- (?). The long ā in *pātērān*, *pātzahr*, *pātrōč*, *pātram*, etc., is perhaps best explained as a *Vṛddhi* formation.

(51) *ōpādīšn* : if genuine <*ava* + *pātaya-*. I can quote no parallel. From *pātaya-* we have also *nipāstan* "place", DkM. 615, 9, *Zartuχšt miyān* ⟨i⟩ 'ān ēsm *nipāst*, "Zoroaster put fuel in the middle of it." Cf. line 19 of the same page ; also *nipastan* "lie", *ibid.*, 667, 8, *kanīk* 'nē pēš[ak] 'hač 'ān 'apāk 'martān 'bē *nipast*, "The maiden had not lain with men before that." So *ibid.*, 671, 11 ; 674, 17, also 755, 15. Cf. Soghd. *np'st* (v. B. Geiger, *WZKM.*, 1933, p. 116).

\**mađih* : to be compared with DkM. 206, 3. ماجه. In *BSOS.*, IX, p. 314, I suggested \*'*āp-gōn* for the latter. I have since had the opportunity of discussing the *Bundahišn* passage (31, 14) with Dr. Henning who suggested that the ماجه of the text represented NP. ارغوان. This view seems to me certainly right, and I would therefore read *mađ-gōn*, "wine-coloured," in DkM. 206, 3.

'*mēy* : our word, written *mzn'y* must be taken either as an ideogram or a pseudo-ideogram. It normally occurs as the translation of Av. *maēya-* (the spellings میخ, میخ, میخ are found), and it is inconceivable that the Phl. translators, with their passion for rendering Avestan words by their nearest phonetic equivalent in Pahlavī, should on this occasion have rendered *maēya-* by *miznāh* (?) rather by the obvious *mēy*. Even with the help of Semitic scholars I have been unable to find an Aramaic word which will in any way fit the signs. Arab. مُزن "rain-cloud" is semantically very close, but there seems

to be no cognate in other Semitic languages, and the admission of Arabic words in Pahlavī—with the exception of a few very late texts—cannot be tolerated. As a pseudo-ideogram we could think of *mīzñāh* < \**maēž* (whence *maēya*) with a double suffix, cf. Yidgha-Munji *mīzäyiko*, Zaza *mīž*, NP. مَنْزَكٌ, “dark sky,” Morgenstierne, *Indo-Iranian Frontier Languages*, ii, p. 230. We must, however, be content to leave the reading of the ideogram doubtful, and transliterate '*mēy*.

Apart from the evidence supplied by the translations from the Avesta, the meaning is assured by the following passages.

DkM. 108, 13. 'āp *MZN'H* *YN YT W* 'ut *MZN'H* 'ō 'āp-*burtār aþr vartēnīt*, “The water is turned into vapour and the vapour is turned into a water-carrying cloud.” I. 22 of the same page, *vārān aþzār vāt MZN'H* 'ut *abr*, “The instruments of rain are wind, vapour, and clouds.” *Ibid.*, 758, 8, *MZN'H* 'ut *tam*. The *MWZN'H* of GrBd. 19, 9, is clearly a corruption of our word : the passage will then read : 'ut-*aš dāt* 'ō *aðyārīh vāt* 'ut *vārān* 'ut [kē] \**MZN'H* 'ut *s<n>ōðān* 'ut *sn<ē>zak*, “And he gave him for his assistance wind and rain, vapour, storm, and snow.”

*zamīk apar-\***dārišn* ff.: the text is hopelessly corrupt, but fortunately GrBd. 133, 5, offers an exact parallel : *vāt dārēt* 'ēn *zamīk aðar-dārišn apar-dārišn* [*martōmān*] *guþr-dārišn*, *zreh-dārišn*. The stages of corruption are now easy to follow. (aðar *dārišn*) has been corrupted into مَدْلُوْلَهُ = *adarih rōšn* (!), and *dārēt* has replaced the second *dārišn*. *gūr* may be a genuine later form of *guþr* “deep place, valley”. لَوْرَهُ, however, corresponds to nothing in the GrBd. passage, but the presence of *gūr* (*guþr*) makes almost certain emendation possible. The opposite of *guþr* “valley” is *čakāt* “peak”; so DkM. 517, 7, 'ēn *tan guþr bē kunišn nē čakāt*, “This body must be made like a valley, not a peak,” cf. the almost identical DkM. 583, 22 ff. The final proof that the لَوْرَهُ of our text is a corruption of *čakāt* is supplied by GrBd. 228, 4, *kōf čakāt guþr, ul-'**dārišn* 'ut *frōt-dārišn* 'nē 'bavēt, “There will be neither mountains, peaks, nor valleys, rising or falling ground.”

(53) *savāk*: cf. BSOS., IX, p. 103. To the references given there add DkM. 295, 16, 'pat amāvandīhā *savākīh* χ"ap rāðēnītārīh i *martōm*, “By the mighty benefit and good arrangement of men.” The reading and connection with *sav-*, *sūt*, etc., seems assured by DkM. 674, 15, ētōn *sūtōmand čeyōn harvisp ax*" *i astōmand savēnītan*, “So beneficial as to benefit all corporeal existence.”